

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office Action dated April 19, 2007, in which the Examiner: 1) noted the specification lacks a reference to a related application; 2) rejected claims 21 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,035,350 (“*Swamy*”) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,669,015 (“*Chidester*”); 3) rejected claims 22 and 24 as being allegedly unpatentable over *Swamy* in view of *Chidester* and U.S. Pat. No. 6,545,587 (“*Hatakeyama*”); and 4) allowed claims 1-16.

In this response, Applicant amends claim 21. Based on the amendments and arguments presented herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

I. SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended to incorporate prior Application No. 09/688,706, filed on October 17, 2000, from which the present application was filed as a continuation application under 37 CFR 1.53(b) on November 18, 2003. For the present application, Applicant intended to rely on the filing date of Application No. 09/688,706.

II. § 103 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected claim 21 as being unpatentable over *Swamy* in view of *Chidester*. Claim 21 has been amended to recite “removal of the I/O device from the computer triggers the processor to automatically configure external video outputs or internal display modes.” None of the references, considered individually or together, teach or suggest this limitation. Further, a similar limitation was allowable for prior Application No. 09/688,706, which issued as Patent No. 6,665,704 on December 16, 2003. For at least these reasons, claim 21 and its dependent claims are allowable.

III. ALLOWED CLAIMS

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-16.

IV. CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicant may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan D. Christenson/
Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400